



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/673,674

09/29/2003

Michael D. Hitchcock

C069

2020

25784 7590 04/26/2007
MICHAEL O. SCHEINBERG
P.O. BOX 164140
AUSTIN, TX 78716-4140

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

04/26/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,674

Applicant(s)

HITCHCOCK ET AL.

Examiner

James H. Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 56, 67, 69-74, 93, 120-128 and 131-133 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 56, 67, 69-74, 93, 120-128 and 131-133 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 129 and 130 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date
:06/26/2006,11/07/2006,02/22/2007.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed 02/15/2007 with a priority date of **06/04/1998**.
2. Claims 56, 67, 69-74, 93, and 120-133 remain pending.
3. Claims 120-133 are new claims.
4. Claim 56 is an independent claim.
5. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd Paragraph have been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment. Specifically, Claims 70, 73-74 were amended and Claims 100, 102, and 112 were cancelled.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 93 depends from Claim 84, which was previously cancelled.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 129 and 130 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 56, 93, 120-125, and 133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (hereinafter Hartman, U.S. Patent No. 5,758,324 filed 02/08/1996, issued 05/26/1998), in view of Himmel et al. (hereinafter Himmel, U.S. Patent No. 6,237,035 filed 12/18/1997, issued 05/22/2001).

In regard to independent Claim 56, Hartman discloses:

- *A method of processing over a computer network forms directed by multiple public forms users to multiple institutions of higher education, the forms being processed by a third party forms servicer that is neither one of the institutions of higher learning nor one of the public forms users (Abstract; → a resume storage and retrieval system whereby potential applicants can post resumes and potential employers can search and receive resumes from those applicants), the method comprising:*
 - *presenting to a form user over a computer network by a third party forms servicer in response to a request from the form user (Fig. 3; Fig. 8A, step S1; Fig. 8B, steps S2, S3; Fig. 9, steps S12-S17, S19; → A job applicant logs into (via communications link, see Fig. 1) a job resume posting site*

(server) (S1) and receives from the server a main menu (S2). The user is provided with several options from the main menu and chooses the option labeled "enter new applicant data" (S3). Applicant is assigned an ID and is requested to send a password (S12-13). The server then generates an empty form for the user to enter data related to a resume they wish to post to the server (S14)).

Though not explicitly disclosed by Hartman, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have assumed that the job server described by Hartman was owned and maintained by a "third party" or "clearing house" and hence, was a "third party" (the other two parties being potential employees and employers) server that provided standardized access to resumes for both potential employees and employers to locate one another, and was the only component of the system to generate and process forms.

Note: the phrase "*multiple institutions of higher education*" is not given any patentable weight, as claimed, since it does not matter who the forms are sent to as long as they are sent to clients from a third party forms server in response to requests. Thus, Hartman's jobs server is understood to send, receive, and process forms requested, filled in, and submitted from multiple clients.

- *a form directed to one of the multiple institutions of higher education, the form being generated by a forms generator that generated multiple forms corresponding to multiple institutions of higher education, the forms including fields for the forms users to enter user information (Fig. 9, steps*

S12-17, S19;→ The server generates an empty form (see Fig. 3, empty fields) for the user and sends (directs) the form to the user for them to enter data related to a resume they wish to post to the jobs server (S14). The user fills out the form (see Fig. 3) and submits the form to the server (S15-16). The submitted form is stored on the server in a database (S19).

- *receiving by the third party forms servicer over the computer network user information and electronic payment information entered by the user* (Col. 9, lines 1-9; Fig. 12B, step S51; Fig. 13, steps S61-S63;→ from the perspective of a potential employer who uses the jobs server to locate resumes fitting search criteria entered into a form (Fig. 4), the employer has the option to obtain resumes either by possessing an existing account with the jobs server, or by purchasing the resumes by entering credit card and other billing information (e.g., by entering those data into a form), and submitting that information to the jobs server for processing.

Thus, the "third party" jobs server receives both payment (credit card) and other information, such as billing information (i.e., user information) from the potential employer client to be processed by the third party jobs server.

- *processing by the third party forms servicer an electronic payment associated with the form, the processed payment being from the user to the one of the multiple institutions to which the form is directed* (Fig. 12B, step S51; Fig. 13, steps S61-63 through path ending at step S60;→ the employer requests to purchase resumes from the server and enters credit

card and other information for billing, data submitted to a bank for verification);

- o *storing by the third party forms servicer at least some of the user information entered on the form (Col. 6, lines 48-50; Fig. 9, step S19;→ submitted form information (potential employee) is stored on the server in a database);*

Hartman fails to explicitly disclose:

- o *maintaining by the third party forms servicer a transaction state for the form so as to prevent duplicate submission or payment.*

However, Himmel discloses (Title; Abstract; Col. 5, lines 44-65;→ a system and method for preventing duplicate transactions in an internet browser/internet server environment. This is performed both from the client and server sides. The server detects any duplicate submission of a form containing a particular transaction sequence number by only accepting a single submission of the form from a client to a server. The server maintains the submission state of the form through the transaction sequence number).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman and Himmel as both references are related to issues concerning the transmission and processing of forms between clients and servers. Adding the disclosure of Himmel provides the benefit of detecting duplicate submission of form data from a client to a server in an otherwise “stateless” system.

In regard to dependent Claim 93, Hartman discloses:

- *receiving electronic payment information includes receiving electronic payment information entered onto the form (see Fig. 12a, steps S46-S48).*

In regard to dependent Claim 120, Hartman fails to disclose:

- *maintaining a transaction state includes maintaining a transaction state using at least one hidden field in a page of the form.*

However, Himmel discloses (Col. 6, lines 33-49; → the “tranid” or “transaction ID”, which keeps track as to whether or not a user has previously submitted a particular form generated by the server and sent to the client, can be inserted as a hidden parameter in the form, or as a variable in an HREF statement).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman and Himmel as both references are related to issues concerning the transmission and processing of forms between clients and servers. Adding the disclosure of Himmel provides the benefit of detecting duplicate submission of form data from a client to a server in an otherwise “stateless” system.

In regard to dependent Claim 121, Hartman fails to disclose:

- *determining whether a payment has been submitted by parsing a hidden field on the page of the form.*

However, Himmel discloses (Col. 6, lines 32-48; → passing variables as hidden form fields between a server and a client to maintain the state (e.g., current value) of those variables during a transaction between the two.

Himmel also discloses the use of such a passed hidden variable to determine whether or not a form had been submitted more than once (Abstract; Fig. 3). In the case of Himmel, the value (state) of a hidden variable is changed once the user clicks the form's submit button. For the remainder of the transaction between the client and the server, that change in value, as parsed from the form by the server, prevents the form from being submitted more than once.

It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have used the mechanism disclosed by Himmel, as a merchant running a server could define a variable (e.g., flag) to indicate the current state of whether a payment had been entered. When the user enters payment into the form, JavaScript code embedded by the server into the form could execute to change the payment flag value (state) so that when the user submitted the form with payment, the server would compare values and detect a change and be modified to act accordingly to the presence of payment information. One advantage of such a mechanism would be to validate whether or not a payment had been entered.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman and Himmel as both references are related to issues concerning the transmission and processing of forms between clients and servers. Adding the disclosure of Himmel provides the benefit of form validation by checking the state of a previously set value for changes.

In regard to dependent Claim 122, Hartman fails to disclose:

- *the maintaining a transaction state includes*
 - *maintaining the form within one state selected from a set of states, the set of states including an active state, a submitted state, and a paid state.*

However, Himmel discloses (Fig. 3; → a transaction state that keeps track of whether or not a submitted form has been previously submitted or not, interpreted as a submitted state whose value “flips” from what it was prior to the server sending the form to the client and after that same form has been submitted back to the server).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman and Himmel as both references are related to issues concerning the transmission and processing of forms between clients and servers. Adding the disclosure of Himmel provides the benefit of maintaining and communicating transaction state information between a client and a server.

In regard to dependent Claim 123, Hartman discloses:

- *presenting a form to a form user over a computer network includes*
 - *presenting a form using a stateless communications conduit (Col. 5, lines 18-25;→ transfer protocols include HTTP-hypertext transfer protocol well-known to be a stateless protocol).*

In regard to dependent Claim 124, Hartman discloses:

- *the stateless communication conduit includes the World Wide Web (Col. 4, lines 57-64;→ system uses servers connected to the internet and in particular, the servers are web servers).*

In regard to dependent Claim 125, Hartman fails to disclose:

- *the state of the form is maintained in a database table.*

However, Himmel discloses (Fig. 4; Col. 5, line 66 through Col. 6, line 12;→ a function on the server generates a transaction ID and embeds it into a form being generated to be sent to the requesting client. A history (a database) of transaction IDs is maintained for each client (user) on the server)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman and Himmel as both references are related to issues concerning the transmission and processing of forms between clients and

servers. Adding the disclosure of Himmel provides the benefit of maintaining and communicating transaction state information between a client and a server.

In regard to dependent Claim 133, Hartman discloses:

- *a processor for carrying out computer instructions; and a computer readable memory storing instructions for performing the steps of claim 56 (see Fig. 2).*

10. Claims 67, and 69-74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman in view of Himmel, and in further view of Daniels et al. (hereinafter Daniels, U.S. Patent No. 5,758,126 filed 03/19/1996, issued 05/26/1998).

In regard to dependent Claim 67, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *presenting ... a second form directed to one of the multiple institutions of higher education; and*
- *automatically inserting into the second form user information previously entered onto a form by the form user.*

However, Daniels discloses (Col. 13, lines 9-51; → the notion of *turn-around*, which allows a user client (30) to generate a turn-around document in response to a document received from sponsor client 20 (e.g., *requesting a second document*). Turn-around functionality is accessed from a "doc turn" button on the tool bar of the main menu. When the doc turn button is actuated, a dialog is opened which allows an operator of user client 30 to select which document is being responded to by document number and which turn-around document is being generated. When the turn-around document has

been selected, the information fields of the GUI representing the turn-around document are *populated with information from the original electronic form*).

Thus, Daniels pre-populates information from the first form into the second requested form.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel and Daniels as all three inventions relate to forms processing. Adding the disclosure of Daniels provides the benefit of recall of previous inputs to forms.

In regard to dependent Claim 69, Hartman discloses:

- *...presenting a form including multiple pages in that it does allow for the production of forms which, depending on the amount of content provided by the user might span more than a single page (see Fig. 3; → employment history provides for multiple inputs, thus potentially expanding the form to more than a single page).*

In regard to dependent Claim 70, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *verifying in accordance with validation criteria user information on each of the multiple pages as they are posted by the form user.*

However, Daniels discloses (Col. 9, lines 21-50; → that an electronic forms application preferably includes instant editing functionality which verifies information entered in the fields of a form(s) against an acceptable format or a database of

acceptable entries and thus provides the user of the electronic forms application with immediate feedback about the acceptability of an entry into one of the fields of the form).

Thus, Daniels discloses validation/verification of form content from a client-side application, providing instant checking before information is sent via modem elsewhere.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel and Daniels as all three inventions relate to forms processing. Adding the disclosure of Daniels provides the benefit of forms validation.

In regard to dependent Claim 71, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- ... *verifying the user information at a client computer or at a server computer.*

However, Daniels discloses (Col. 9, lines 21-50; → that an electronic forms application preferably includes instant editing functionality which verifies information entered in the fields of a form(s) against an acceptable format or a database of acceptable entries and thus provides the user of the electronic forms application with immediate feedback about the acceptability of an entry into one of the fields of the form). Thus, Daniels discloses validation/verification of form content from a client-side application, providing instant checking before information is sent via modem elsewhere.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel and Daniels as all three inventions

relate to forms processing. Adding the disclosure of Daniels provides the benefit of forms validation.

In regard to dependent Claim 72, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *the validation criteria are specified by the institution to which the form is directed.*

However Daniels discloses (see Daniels Claims 2, and 23-24; → validation of form input fields based on content and format comparisons to database stored values).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel, and Daniels as all three inventions relate to forms processing. Adding the disclosure of Daniels provides the benefit of forms validation based on provided rules.

In regard to dependent Claim 73, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *verifying in accordance with first validation criteria user information on each of the multiple pages as they are posted and*
- *verifying in accordance with second validation criteria user information when a completed form is submitted.*

However Daniels discloses (see Daniels Claims 2, and 23-24; → validation of form input fields based on content and format comparisons to database stored values).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosure of Hartman, Himmel and Daniels as all three inventions relate

Art Unit: 2176

to forms processing. Adding the disclosure of Daniels provides the benefit of forms validation based on provided rules.

In regard to dependent Claim 74, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *verifying in accordance with first validation criteria includes verifying user information at a client computer and in which*
- *verifying user information in accordance with second validation criteria includes verifying user information at a server computer.*

However Daniels discloses (see Daniels Claims 2, and 23-24; → validation of form input fields based on content and format comparisons to database stored values).

Though it appears from Daniels that both of these verification steps take place either on a client or on a server, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform one or both functions either on a client or on a server, or split between the two. The latter would better split the processing chores between two computers thereby saving time and effort.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel, and Daniels as all three inventions relate to forms processing. Adding the disclosure of Daniels provides the benefit of forms validation based on provided rules.

11. Claims 126-128, and 131-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman in view of Himmel, and in further view of

In regard to dependent Claim 126, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *causing the form to enter a first state after the form user submits payment information and before the payment is settled.*

However, Bartoli discloses (Fig. 2A; → in the process of a user on a client purchasing an item from a merchant using a “third party” billing system, a state exists where the form information has been submitted to the billing server and prior to the payment being settled. That is, steps (B201, 203, 205, 206, 207) perform steps confirming that the user who submitted the form information is indeed the person who is on file as having been associated with that form information (some information transmitted in a cookie (Col. 5, lines 1-4, 25-37)).

Thus, Bartoli discloses a *first state*, as described by the claim limitation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel, and Bartoli as all three of these inventions are related to the processing of forms and form data. Adding the disclosure of Bartoli provides the benefit of tracking the various stages of a transaction so that the client and servers maintain proper “bookkeeping”.

In regard to dependent Claim 127, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *causing the form to enter a second state after the payment is settled.*

However, Bartoli discloses (Figs. 2A, 2B; → once the billing system has authorized the transaction (B208) a new cookie with new random number and sequence number is sent to the client. Those numbers indicating that a transaction has been successfully completed and the client is then ready for a new transaction. In changing these numbers, a state has been changed from the first state existing at steps (B201, 203, 205-207) to a second state).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel, and Bartoli as all three of these inventions are related to the processing of forms and form data. Adding the disclosure of Bartoli provides the benefit of tracking the various stages of a transaction so that the client and servers maintain proper "bookkeeping".

In regard to dependent Claim 128, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *causing the form to enter the first state prevents the form user from making further changes to the form.*

However, Bartoli discloses (Fig. 2A; → steps where a cookie was not sent (NO, step B201) and two paths which return to the client (C204, C205) instructing them to either enter an ID and Password and "Click to Buy" again, or to contact customer service.

Based on the flowchart of Fig. 2A, there are no apparent opportunities to alter the form since the form is only show to be filled out and sent at step (C207).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel, and Bartoli as all three of these inventions are related to the processing of forms and form data. Adding the disclosure of Bartoli provides the benefit of tracking the various stages of a transaction so that the client and servers maintain proper "bookkeeping".

In regard to dependent Claim 131, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *the form enters a paid state after payment is submitted and before the payment is acknowledged by the institution or settled,*

However, Bartoli discloses (Fig. 2B; → step B208 is the step after the user has issued the "Click to Buy", representing that payment was submitted by the user, and prior to the remaining steps following authorization and completion of the order and delivery (or confirmation thereof) of purchased goods. This is interpreted as a *paid state*.

Bartoli also discloses:

- *the form then enters a completed state when the form is acknowledged by the institution and the payment is settled (Fig. 2B, path from B208 to B210, to C207, etc. ending with C208; M204 where the client receives acknowledgement of the purchase and the content, and the merchant receives acknowledgement of the purchase).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel, and Bartoli as all three of these inventions are related to the processing of forms and form data. Adding the disclosure of Bartoli provides the benefit of tracking the various stages of a transaction so that the client and servers maintain proper "bookkeeping".

In regard to dependent Claim 132, both Hartman and Himmel fail to disclose:

- *if the form is not settled, the form returns to an active state.*

However, Bartoli discloses (Fig. 2A; → steps where a cookie was not sent (NO, step B201) and two paths which return to the client (C204, C205) instructing them to either enter an ID and Password and "Click to Buy" again (state goes from submitted to "active" at least for C204). Alternate states exist in C205, C206 where the customer is instructed to contact a customer service representative. One conceivable option at this point would be for the user to contact customer service while the form remained filled out on their client browser. This scenario would also represent returning to an active state.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Hartman, Himmel, and Bartoli as all three of these inventions are related to the processing of forms and form data. Adding the disclosure of Bartoli provides the benefit of tracking the various stages of a transaction so that the client and servers maintain proper "bookkeeping".

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant argues that the prior arts of Hartman, Tobin, Daniels, and Wong all fail to disclose the amended limitation to independent Claim 56 of *"maintaining by the third party forms servicer a transaction state for the form so as to prevent duplicate submission or payment"*. The Examiner would agree and withdraws the rejection. In light of the added limitation and cancellation of previous claim language, the Examiner makes a new rejection and includes the prior art of Himmel, which in combination with Hartman discloses the new limitation.

13. With respect to Claim 56, the phrase "third party forms servicer" is broadly interpreted to indicate any servicer (e.g., a web server) excluding those specified in the preamble of this claim.

14. Applicant argues that the prior art of Hartman fails to disclose "presenting ... a form directed to one of the multiple institutions of higher education, the form being generated by a forms generator that generates multiple forms corresponding to multiple institutions of higher education".

15. The Examiner respectfully disagrees to the extent that Hartman supplies forms to potential clients (employees or employers).

16. The Examiner would agree that Hartman doesn't explicitly disclose forms directed to multiple institutions of higher learning.

Art Unit: 2176

17. The Examiner respectfully argues however that multiple institutions of higher learning are merely a form of client, each client requesting forms from a server that is separate from the client.

18. Hartman is felt to disclose this feature to the extent of the broad interpretation of the institutions of higher learning as clients and the understanding that the jobs servicer is a third party generating and processing forms from those clients.

Conclusion

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

20. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2176

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

22. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James H. Blackwell
04/18/2007



Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100